

## REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application, with claims 1 and 13 being in independent form. Claims 1, 2, and 13 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention.

As an initial matter, paragraph 1 of the Office Action appears to be cut off. If any substantive comments on the part of the Examiner have been inadvertently left out, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide them. Applicants kindly thank the Examiner for her assistance.

At paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the abstract was objected to for not being in the proper format. It is submitted that the abstract has been corrected, and, accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent No. 5,627,996 to Bauer in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2005/0050054 to Clark and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0116402 to Luke; claims 4 and 5, as being obvious from Bauer in view of Clark and Luke and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0123111 to Makita; claim 8, as being obvious from Bauer in view of Clark and Luke and Reference AL (IDS); claim 11, as being obvious from Bauer in view of Clark and Luke and U.S. Patent No. 6,788,302 to Ditlow; and claims 13 and 14, as being obvious from Bauer in view of Clark.

Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 13, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the following reasons.

In the *Response to Arguments* section at paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the

Examiner states:

Applicant argues in substance in FACT 1, page 11, that Bauer's system provide at least two computers which operates under different OSs, which is one of the features of the mentioned prior art, but in the claimed language of the present application claim 1 recites "the computer system under operation of said OS program" which is not being specific about using a single computer, the mentioned computer system according to the specification (Fig. 7) shows a "network" which can be more than one "computer system" and according to: Par [0095], "where another computer system is logged into via a network"; Bauer's prior art covers the mentioned limitations. It is suggested that the claim language be amended to clarify that the claimed invention refers to a single unit computer system comprising only one computer with only one operating system, and provide the citation of the proper paragraphs that enable such claim.

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 13 herein in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, so that the claimed invention refers to a single unit computer system comprising only one computer with only one operating system. Support for these amendments can be found in the present specification, at least at Section 1, pages 7-8, which state:

FIG. 1 is a block diagram showing components involved in file storage and read-out processes in a general computer system. As illustrated, this computer system comprises the respective elements of a memory 10, a program execution unit 20, a storage processing unit 30, an spread processing unit 40, a file storage unit 50, a filename presentation unit 60, and a user interface unit 70. In general, memory 10 is arranged from a RAM or other volatile memory and is used for spread and temporary storage of data to be processed. Program execution unit 20 is a component having a function of applying predetermined processes, based on predetermined programs, on the data which are spread on memory 10 and is realized by **a CPU** or other logical processing hardware and **an OS program**, application programs, and other software. Though obviously a hard disk device, ROM, or other memory that stores the respective programs, a portion of a RAM that is used as a working area during program execution, etc., are also components that make up program execution unit 20, here these elements shall be referred to collectively as program execution unit 20. (Emphasis added.)

According to the above description, the computer system shown in Fig. 1 comprises program execution unit 20 which is realized by **a CPU** and **an OS program**. The computer system shown in Fig. 2 is a basic embodiment of the present invention, and there is another

description in the first paragraph of Section 2 in page 10 of the present specification, as follows:

FIG. 2 is a block diagram showing a computer system of a basic embodiment of this invention. The computer system shown in FIG. 2 has a storage control unit 35, a spread control unit 45, a presentation control unit 65, a correspondence information storage unit 80, and a user recognition unit 90 **added thereto as new components with respect to the general, conventional computer system shown in FIG. 1**, and by the addition of these components, adequate security can be ensured for filenames as well. The functions of these new components shall first be described.

That is, the system shown in Fig. 2 also comprises a CPU and an OS program. Therefore, “A single unit computer system comprising only one computer (CPU) with only one operating system” as claimed in amended claims 1 and 13, is supported at least by the above-mentioned paragraphs.

For all the foregoing reasons, Applicants understand that the Examiner will agree that independent claims 1 and 13 are patentable over the cited references according to the Examiner’s suggestion. If, however, the Examiner nevertheless maintains the rejections of claims 1 and 13 over the cited references, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants’ undersigned representative to discuss this issue further in an effort to resolve this issue and advance the case to issue.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or the other of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Rejection is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and its entry is therefore believed proper under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.116. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment After Final Rejection, as an earnest effort to advance

prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. As noted above, should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully Submitted

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'RaD', is written over a horizontal line.

Raymond A. DiPerna  
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP  
26 West 61<sup>st</sup> Street  
New York, New York 10023  
Reg. No. 44,063  
Tel. No. (212) 708-1950